APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,627	09/25/2003	Michael K. Martyn	200309767-1	8079

22879   7590   08/23/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
VUU, HENRY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 September 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☒ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sprague

et al. (Publication No. 2004/0070613) in view of Robinson et al. (Publication No.

2002/0065844).

As to claim 23, Sprague teaches a system (computer 12 – see e.g., paragraph

[0021]) for displaying (see e.g., paragraph [0027] – i.e. the user interface (UI) displays

the meta elements for the user to enter values) a plurality of metadata elements (see

e.g., paragraph [0028] – i.e. the metadata elements corresponds to "Name",

""Description", "Owner", etc.) and values of the metadata elements (see e.g., Fig. 2 –

the metadata element corresponds to "Name" and the metadata vale corresponds to

"MetaData") on a document file. Sprague further teaches receiving commands to load

the document file (see e.g., paragraph [0022] – i.e. pressing the start button is the

command to load the document file) into a computing devices memory (see e.g.,

paragraph [0023] – i.e. the printed document is stored locally or remotely in computer

12). Sprague does not teach assigning labels to the plurality of metadata elements and

displaying the labels and values of the plurality of metadata elements. Robinson

teaches assigning labels to a plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0036]

through [0042] – i.e. "udt1, ust1, ust2, ust3, fdst and zpos are labels, while "Item Value",

"Item Description", "Item Location" and "Item Distance" are metadata elements

displayed on the form), and a command to display the labels assigned to the plurality of

metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0036] – i.e. the user utilizes gateway server 18

website and clicks on a link, which generates a command that brings the user to a form

where the user can define the tags and labels, which in turn displays the label on the

form). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of displaying a plurality of

metadata elements, values of the metadata elements and commands to load the

document file of Sprague with Robinson's assigning and displaying metadata labels

because the form taught in Robinson enables the user to reorder the data when the

user realizes that a different order would be more suitable (see e.g., Robinson et al.

paragraph [0045]).

3.   Claims 1 – 19, 22, 24 – 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sprague et al. (Publication No. 2004/0070613) in view of Kawai et al.

(Publication No. 2003/0107602) and further in view of Robinson et al. (Publication No.

2002/0065844).

        As to claim 1, Sprague teaches a method for displaying metadata placed on a

document (see e.g., paragraph [0025] – i.e. the user interface (UI) is used for entering

metadata on the template and the metadata corresponds to metadata fields such as

"Name", "Owner", etc., which are displayed on the UI as shown in Fig.1), by accepting a

command to load a document file (see e.g., paragraph [0022] – i.e. pressing the start

button is the command to load the document file) into a memory of a computing device

(see e.g., paragraph [0023] – i.e. the printed document is stored locally or remotely in

computer 12), a command line interface (MetaDataPrompt – see e.g., paragraph

[0047]), having a plurality of metadata elements in the document file (see e.g.,

paragraph [0028], lines 6 – 15, i.e. the plurality of metadata elements are "Name",

"Description", "Owner", etc.), and allowing the user to verify the value of at least one of

the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0029] – i.e. the user interface

(UI) of Fig.1 will allow the user to visually verify the value of each metadata element for

modification). Sprague teaches the limitations discussed above but does not teach a

computer-aided design application. Kawai teaches the use of a computer-aided design

(CAD) application that has various advantages compared to paper based product

designing (see e.g., paragraph [0005]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of

metadata elements and values of Sprague with the CAD application taught in Kawai

because the CAD application of Kawai has functionalities of modifying data, performing

simulation, searching and the reuse of data over conventional paper designing (see

e.g., Kawai et al. paragraph [0005]).

As discussed above, both Sprague and Kawai teaches their respective limitations

but does not further include the teachings of assigning a label to each of a plurality of

metadata elements, and a command to display the label assigned to at least one of the

plurality of metadata elements. Robinson teaches assigning labels to a plurality of

metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0036] through [0042] – i.e. "udt1, ust1, ust2,

ust3, fdst and zpos are labels, while "Item Value", "Item Description", "Item Location"

and "Item Distance" are metadata elements displayed on the form), and a command to

display the labels assigned to the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph

[0036] – i.e. the user utilizes gateway server 18 website and clicks on a link, which

generates a command that brings the user to a form where the user can define the tags

and labels, which in turn displays the label on the form). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate the teachings of displaying metadata, a command to load the document, a

command line interface and verification of the metadata element value of Sprague and

Kawai's CAD application with assigning and displaying metadata labels of Robinson

because the form taught in Robinson enables the user to reorder the data when the

user realizes that a different order would be more suitable (see e.g., Robinson et al.

paragraph [0045]).

As to independent claim 12, claim 12 differs from claim 1 only in that claim 12 is

an apparatus claim using a processor (computer 12 – Sprague clearly teaches a

processor in which a computer comprises a processor in order to execute instructions),

a user interface (user interface – see e.g., paragraph [0055]), and a display (display

screen – see e.g., paragraph [0008]), whereas claim 1 is a method claim. Thus, claim

12 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claim 18, Sprague teaches a computing device (computer 12 – see e.g., paragraph [0021], line 15), for displaying a plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0025] – i.e. the user interface (UI) is used for entering metadata on the template and the metadata corresponds to metadata fields such as "Name", "Owner", etc., which are displayed on the UI as shown in Fig.1), a user communicating with an application (see e.g., paragraph [0038], lines 1 – 5, i.e. the user communicates with the application by means of using keyboard 206 to enter alphanumeric values), and displaying metadata values (see e.g., paragraph [0028] and Fig. 2 – i.e. wherein the metadata element is "Name" and the value of the metadata element is "MetaData"). Sprague teaches the limitations discussed above, but does not teach the application being a computer-aided design (CAD) application that is used to develop a document that describes an article of manufacture, which loads a file that corresponds to the document into a memory of a computing device. Kawai teaches a computer-aided design (CAD) application (CAD system – see e.g., paragraph [0029], line 3) that is used to develop a document (CAD drawing 12 – see e.g., paragraph [0033]) that describes an article of manufacture (see e.g., paragraph [0079] – i.e., article of manufacture corresponding mechanical parts are referred to automobile parts, electric appliances, machine tools, and toys). Kawai further teaches the application loading a file corresponding to the document into memory (see e.g., paragraph [0009] – [0010]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of metadata elements and values of Sprague with the CAD application taught in Kawai because the CAD application of

Kawai has functionalities of modifying data, performing simulation, searching and the

reuse of data over conventional paper designing (see e.g., Kawai et al. paragraph

[0005]).

As discussed above, both Sprague and Kawai teaches their respective limitations

but does not further include the teachings of assigning a label to each of a plurality of

metadata elements, and a command to display the label assigned to at least on of the

plurality of metadata elements. Robinson teaches assigning labels to a plurality of

metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0036] through [0042] – i.e. "udt1, ust1, ust2,

ust3, fdst and zpos are labels, while "Item Value", "Item Description", "Item Location"

and "Item Distance" are metadata elements displayed on the form), and a command to

display the labels assigned to the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph

[0036] – i.e. the user utilizes gateway server 18 website and clicks on a link, which

generates a command that brings the user to a form where the user can define the tags

and labels, which in turn displays the label on the form). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate the teachings of Sprague and Kawai with assigning and displaying

metadata labels of Robinson because the form taught in Robinson enables the user to

reorder the data when the user realizes that a different order would be more suitable

(see e.g., Robinson et al. paragraph [0045]).

As to claim 25, Sprague teaches a computer-readable media (shared

memory/storage 16 – see e.g., paragraph [0021]), that tangibly embodies a program of

instructions (see e.g., paragraph [0044] – i.e. XRX_DSCRPT_METADATA is a script

embodied in a software) executable by a computing device (computer 12 – see e.g.,

paragraph [0021]), to display document metadata (see e.g., paragraph [0025] – i.e. the

user interface (UI) is used for entering metadata on the template and the metadata

corresponds to metadata fields such as "Name", "Owner", etc., which are displayed on

the UI as shown in Fig.1) on a display (see e.g., paragraph [0008] – [0011], i.e. the user

interface is displayed on a display screen), and the computing device displaying

document metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0025] – i.e. the user interface (UI)

is used for entering metadata on the template and the metadata corresponds to

metadata fields such as "Name", "Owner", etc., which are displayed on the UI as shown

in Fig.1) and the values of the metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0029] – i.e. the

user interface (UI) of Fig.1 will allow the user to visually verify the value of each

metadata element for modification). Kawai teaches loading a computer file (see e.g.,

paragraph [0009] – [0010], i.e. importing relational information and data) corresponding

to an article of manufacture (see e.g., paragraph [0079] – i.e., article of manufacture

corresponding mechanical parts are referred to automobile parts, electric appliances,

machine tools, and toys). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of metadata

elements and values of Sprague with the CAD application taught in Kawai because the

CAD application of Kawai has functionalities of modifying data, performing simulation,

searching and the reuse of data over conventional paper designing (see e.g., paragraph

Kawai et al. [0005]).

Both Sprague and Kawai teaches the limitations discussed above, but does not

teach, assigning labels to the elements of the document metadata, and displaying the

labels and value of each of the elements of the document metadata. Robinson teaches

assigning labels to a plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0036] through

[0042] – i.e. "udt1, ust1, ust2, ust3, fdst and zpos are labels, while "Item Value", "Item

Description", "Item Location" and "Item Distance" are metadata elements displayed on

the form), and a command to display the labels assigned to the plurality of metadata

elements (see e.g., paragraph [0036] – i.e. the user utilizes gateway server 18 website

and clicks on a link, which generates a command that brings the user to a form where

the user can define the tags and labels, which in turn displays the label on the form).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Sprague and Kawai with assigning

and displaying metadata labels of Robinson because the form taught in Robinson

enables the user to reorder the data when the user realizes that a different order would

be more suitable (see e.g., paragraph [0045]).

As to claim 2, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim

1 above. Sprague clearly teaches accepting a command (see e.g., paragraph [0030],

lines 7 – 9, i.e. the command is the user selecting the edit feature 122 of Fig. 2) to

correct the value of at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g.,

paragraph [0049], lines 5 – 7, i.e. the user is able to edit or delete the default value

displayed on the field).

As to claim 3, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim

2 above. Sprague teaches accepting an input generated by the user to correct the value

of at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0038] – i.e.

the acceptance of input generated from the user to correct the value of one of the

plurality of metadata elements can be shown by the use of keyboard 206, which the

user enters alphanumeric values).

As to claim 4, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim

2 above. Sprague teaches accepting an input generated by the computing device to

correct the at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0031]

in conjunction with paragraph [0044] – i.e. after the user selects the update field in

Fig.3, the computing device processes the script to execute the command for editing a

metadata element).

As to claim 5, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim

4 above. Sprague teaches the plurality of metadata elements includes at least a

person's name, revision identifier, and a document title (see e.g., paragraph [0028] – i.e.

the metadata element corresponds to "Name", "Description", "Owner", "Address" and

"Title"). This claim is given weight to the phrase "one or more", in which only one of a

person's name, revision identifier or a document title is addressed.

As to claim 6, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim

1 above. Robinson teaches the labels assigned to each of the plurality of metadata

elements correspond to the value of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g.,

paragraph [0037] – [0044], i.e. the metadata label corresponds to "ust3", the metadata

element corresponds to "Item Location", and user enters values that corresponds to a store location).

As to claim 7, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. Sprague teaches the document discussed in claim 1, while Kawai teaches a drawing that describes an article of manufacture corresponding to a mechanical part (see e.g., paragraph [0079] – i.e., article of manufacture corresponding mechanical parts are referred to automobile parts, electric appliances, machine tools, and toys). Thus combining both Sprague's document and Kawai's CAD drawing of an article of manufacture meets the limitations of claim 7.

As to claim 8, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. Kawai teaches the document as a drawing that describes an article of manufacture corresponding to one of an electrical device or a system that performs a computer function (see e.g., paragraph [0079] – i.e. the electrical device corresponds to electric appliances). This claim is given weight to addressing the document as a drawing that can be an electrical device or a system that performs a computer function, thus the electrical appliance described in Kawai meets the limitation of an electrical device.

As to claim 9, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. Sprague teaches displaying incorrect portions of at least one of the plurality of metadata elements this is discernable from correct portions of at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0030] –[0031], i.e. the box labeled

"Field Attribute" 124 can be used to view, display and edit any incorrect metadata elements that is discernable from correct portions of metadata elements).

As to claim 10, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. Sprague teaches a document (see e.g., paragraph [0025]) and Kawai further teaches the document being generated by a computer-aided design application (see e.g., paragraph [0029], line 2 –3). Thus the combination of Sprague's document and Kawai's CAD application meets the limitations of claim 10.

As to claim 11, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. A "table" is defined as an orderly arrangement of data, in the form of columns and rows (see e.g., Merriam-Webster Dictionary). Sprague teaches the plurality of metadata elements is placed within a table on the document (see e.g., Fig. 2 – i.e. it can be distinguished that the metadata elements such as "Name", "Description" and "Owner" are arranged in a column and the metadata values are arranged in the same row as their corresponding metadata elements).

As to dependent claim 13, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 12 discussed above, in which Sprague clearly teaches a user interface (user interface – see e.g., paragraph [0055]) that operates in a command line mode (MetaDataPrompt – see e.g., paragraph [0047]) is introduced.

As to dependent claim 14, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 12 above, wherein Kawai clearly teaches the document is a drawing that specifies an article of manufacturer (see e.g., paragraph [0079]).

As to dependent claim 15, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 12 above, wherein Sprague clearly teaches the metadata elements include one or more of a person's name, a revision identifier, and a document title (see e.g., paragraph [0028]). This claim is given weight to the phrase "one or more", in which only one of a person's name, revision identifier or a document title is addressed.

As to claim 16, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 12 above, where the processor (computer 12 – Sprague clearly teaches a processor in which a computer comprises a processor in order to execute instructions) performs corrections to at least some of the values of the metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0031] in conjunction with paragraph [0044] – i.e. after the user selects the update field in Fig.3, the computing device processes the script to execute the command for editing a metadata element) in response to a user specifying a correction to one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0038] – i.e. the acceptance of input generated from the user to correct the value of one of the plurality of metadata elements can be shown by the use of keyboard 206, which the user enters alphanumeric values).

As to claim 17, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 16 above. Sprague teaches the document includes a plurality of pages (see e.g., Fig. 1 – Fig. 8) and the display (display screen – see e.g., paragraph [0008]) displays values of the metadata elements on one of the plurality of pages (see e.g., Fig. 2 – i.e. The value is "MetaData" and the metadata element is "Name") in response to the processor (computer 12 – Sprague clearly teaches a processor in which a computer comprises a processor in order to execute instructions), a user interface (user interface

– see e.g., paragraph [0055]) receiving a corresponding command (see e.g., [0031]).

Sprague teaches all the above limitations but does not teach the plurality of pages that

specifies an article of manufacture. Kawai teaches a computer-aided application and

drawing that specifies an article of manufacture (CAD drawing 12 – see e.g., paragraph

[0033]) that describes an article of manufacture (see e.g., paragraph [0079] – i.e., article

of manufacture corresponding mechanical parts are referred to automobile parts,

electric appliances, machine tools, and toys). Thus combining both Sprague and Kawai

meets the limitations of claim 17.

As to claim 19, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 18 above. Sprague

teaches the user communicating with an application by way of a command line interface

(MetaDataPrompt – see e.g., paragraph [0047], i.e. the MetaDataPrompt is presented to

the user to ask for the desired metadata value), while Kawai teaches a computer-aided

design application (see e.g., paragraph [0029], line 2 –3). Thus, combining both

Sprague's command line interface with Kawai's computer-aided design application

meets the limitations of claim 19.

As to claim 22, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to

claim 18 above. Sprague teaches displaying values of at least some of the plurality of

metadata elements (see e.g., Fig 2 – i.e. the metadata element "Name" displays the

value "MetaData" on the user interface (UI)). Robinson teaches receiving a command to

display values (see e.g., paragraph [0045] – i.e. the form is provided to the user for

reorganization of the data) corresponding to metadata elements having a certain

character string (see e.g., paragraph [0037], line 3 – i.e. ust1 and ust2 store up to 64

characters) in the assigned label (see e.g., paragraph [0037] through [0045] – i.e. ust1,

ust2, are labels that store up to 64 character strings).

As to claim 24, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to

claim 23 above. Sprague clearly teaches accepting a command (see e.g., paragraph

[0030], lines 7 – 9, i.e. the command is the user selecting the edit feature 122 of Fig. 2)

to correct the value of at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g.,

paragraph [0049], lines 5 – 7, i.e. the user is able to edit or delete the default value

displayed on the field).

As to claim 26, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to

claim 25 above. Sprague teaches a computer-readable media (shared memory/storage

– see e.g., paragraph [0021]) wherein the computing device (computer 12 – see e.g.,

paragraph [0021]) accepting a command from a user by way of a command line

interface (MetaDataPrompt – see e.g., paragraph [0047], i.e. the MetaDataPrompt is

presented to the user to ask for the desired metadata value).

As to claim 29, this calim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to

claim 25 above. . Claim 29 differs from claim 22 only in that claim 29 includes a

computer-readable medium (shared memory/storage – see e.g., paragraph [0021]),

which is taught by Sprague.

4.   Claims 20, 21, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sprague et al. (Publication No. 2004/0070613) in view of Kawai et al.

(Publication No. 2003/0107602), further in view of Robinson et al. (Publication No. 2002/0065844) and further in view of Porter et al. (Publication No. 2002/0099737).

As to claims 20, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 18 above. Sprague, Robinson and Kawai teach their respective limitations but they do not teach a computing device determining that at least a portion of one of the plurality of metadata elements are incorrect. Porter teaches accessing, analyzing metadata, in which incorrect metadata elements are corrected (see e.g., paragraph [0032] – i.e. if a portion of the metadata element and value is missing, it is added to the metadata). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of a computing device for displaying a plurality of metadata elements, a user communicating with an application, and displaying metadata values of Sprague with Kawai's CAD application and incorporating the assigning of labels to metadata elements and a command to display the labels assigned to the metadata elements taught by Robinson with the correction of incorrect metadata elements of Porter because it improves the quality of the metadata associated with the media (see e.g., Porter et al. paragraph [0009]).

As to claim 21, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 20 above. Sprague teaches displaying incorrect portions of at least one of the plurality of metadata elements this is discernable from correct portions of at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., paragraph [0030] – [0031], i.e. the box labeled "Field Attribute" 124 can be used to view, display and edit any incorrect metadata elements that is discernable from correct portions of metadata elements).

As to claim 27, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 25 above. Claim 27 differs from claim 20 only in that claim 27 includes a computer-readable medium (shared memory/storage – see e.g., paragraph [0021]), which is taught by Sprague. Thus, combining Sprague and Porter meets the limitations of claim 27.

As to claim 28, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 25 above. Claim 28 differs from claim 21 only in that claim 28 includes a computer-readable medium (shared memory/storage – see e.g., paragraph [0021]), which is taught by Sprague.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. MacPhail et al. (Patent No. 6,593,943) can be cited as pertinent art in which MacPhail teaches the use of metadata labels within a data structure format.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Vuu whose telephone number is (571)270-1048. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on (571) 270-1048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Date: 8/14/2006

Examiner's Signature:

Examiner's Initials: H. V.

CHANH D. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER